

### REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated April 27, 2005. Claims 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 13, 17-19, 21, 22, 24, 27-29 and 31-44 were examined. A non-narrowing amendment has been made to claim 37.

#### Preliminary Matter

A copy of the initialed Form 1449 and a copy of the Form 892 from the issued U.S. Patent No. 6,625,634 (the parent) accompany this response. Since these references from the parent have already been considered, the copies of the forms are being supplied so that the considered references appear on the face of a patent that issues from the current patent application.

#### Non-statutory Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 13, 17-19, 21, 22, 24, 27-29 and 31-44 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,634 issued to Tremblay et al (hereinafter "Tremblay '634"). Applicant submits a terminal disclaimer to overcome the judicially created non-statutory double patenting rejection.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 37 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis error.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 13, and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,408,321 issued to Jonathan H. Shiell (hereinafter Shiell) and as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,959,874 issued to Lin et al. (hereinafter "Lin"). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shiell. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Shiell

The rejection with Shiell refers to a conventional carry and not a generate carry instruction that indicates a carry condition. Shiell discloses a carry control signal that controls the carry input selection of each carry input multiplexers (col. 3, lines 9 – 11). The Office refers to a Co signal of Figure 2, but Figures 2a – 2c of Shiell do not depict Co signal. Figures 2a – 2c of Shiell “illustrate examples of three types of instruction coding used with the example arithmetic logic unit illustrated in FIG. 1” (col. 2, lines 22 – 24), none of which are generate carry instructions. Figure 1 depicts the Co signal. At col. 3, lines 63 – 65, Shiell states that

Each of the sections 111, 121, 131 and 141 have a corresponding carry inputs Ci and carry outputs Co. These carry inputs Ci and carry outputs Co for each section are the ordinary carries known in the art.

Use of the carry control signal and the Co signal can be found at col. 3, lines 9 – 25 of Shiell. Neither this section, nor any other section, discloses execution of instances of a generate carry instruction as recited in claim 36.

Lin

The Office also rejects claim 36 referring to Figures 6 and 8 of Lin. The Office states that Figure 6 of Lin discloses execution of an instruction and that Figure 8 discloses outputting signals to indicate carry conditions. However, the statements by the Office do not comport with the statements in Lin. Lin states that Figure 6 “illustrates the control signal format used in the computer system to indicate the use of packed data” and Figure 8 “illustrates a circuit capable of manipulating individual bits of packed data” (col. 2, lines 11 – 12, and lines 17 – 18). Although Lin discloses carry propagation and carries, neither Figure 6, Figure 8, nor any other section of Lin discloses or suggests execution of a generate carry instruction indicate a carry condition as recited in claim 36.

Conclusion

In summary, claims 3, 4, 8, 10, 12, 13, 17-19, 21, 22, 24, 27-29 and 31-44 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently

handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being

- ☒ deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.  
☐ facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.

  
Steven R. Gilliam

28-Jul-2005  
Date

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: \_\_\_\_\_

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Gilliam, Reg. No. 51,734  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
(512) 338-6320  
(512) 338-6301 (fax)